Symposium Gender Apartheid and Islam Part 3

By Jamie Glazov

FrontPageMagazine.com | December 31, 2004

Spencer: The statements of Mr. El-Mallah and Ms. Roach here are so outstandingly disingenuous, misleading, and deceiving to the uninformed, that it would take a book-length treatise to unravel them completely. For example, about the Qur'anic chapter entitled "The Women," Mr. El-Mallah asserts that "if Islam is looking down to [sic] women, the chapter would not have been called 'The Women' or at least you would find another chapter called 'The Men.'" He breezily ignores my point that the names of the chapters of the Qur'an confer no honor cf. the suras named "Spoils of War" (8), "Haggling" (64), "Divorce" (65), "Soul-Snatchers" (79), "The Cheats" (83), "The Earthquake" (99), "The Calamity" (101), "The Traducer" (104), and "The Disbelievers" (109). Fine, Mr. El-Mallah; so I guess that by your logic Islam is not looking down on soul-snatchers, cheats, traducers, or disbelievers either, eh?

Likewise disingenuous is his treatment of other Qur'anic verses that Ali Sina and I have allegedly "taken out of context" (that ever-ready refuge for dishonest politicians everywhere). Mr. El-Mallah says in reference to Qur'an 4:11-12, which stipulates that a woman's inheritance is to be half of that of her brothers, that "this does not mean in anyway that a sister is worth half of her brother." Except financially, obviously. His argument that "this variation in inheritance shares is only consistent with the variations in financial responsibilities" founders on the fact that a woman in the Islamic world who for whatever reason must fend for herself doesn't for that reason receive more of an inheritance.

About Qur'an 33:50, which Ali Sina had pointed out as meaning "that if a women becomes captive in a war, her Muslim master is allowed to rape her," Mr. El-Mallah says: "The cited verse has nothing to do with rape at all, not sure what type of translation or interpretation Mr. Sina is using?" Very well: I will use the English translation most beloved by Muslims, that of Abdullah Yusuf Ali: "O Prophet! We have made lawful to thee thy wives to whom thou hast paid their dowers; and those whom thy right hand possesses out of the prisoners of war whom Allah has assigned to thee…" In other words, a Muslim may have sexual relations with his wives and with prisoners of war. I would ask Mr. El-Mallah to produce one verse of the Qur'an that requires that those enslaved (for that is what the Qur'anic _expression "those whom thy right hand possesses" means) prisoners must consent to these relations. Of course there is none, for the very concept of consent on the part of a slave is unthinkable. But sexual relations without consent is rape.

As for Qur'an 2:223, Mr. El-Mallah accurately recounts the anti-Semitic hadith accusing Jews of spreading a superstition about cross-eyed children. His explanation does nothing, however, to mitigate the larger trouble caused by this verse: it envisions a woman as the possession of her husband, to be used by him as he wills. This impression is reinforced by numerous ahadith, such as this: "Allah's Apostle said, 'If a husband calls his wife to his bed (i.e. to have sexual relation) and she refuses and causes him to sleep in anger, the angels will curse her till morning.'" (Bukhari IV:54:460).

In connection with the infamous "wife-beating" verse, Qur'an 4:34, Mr. El-Mallah complains that "the problem with many Islam-bashers is that they keep their eyes away from any Hadith that explains certain aspects of the Quran verses." Like many other Muslim apologists, he quotes (without citation) a hadith that has Muhammad telling men to beat their wives with nothing more than a *siwak*, a toothbrush. In fact, this hadith does not appear in Bukhari, Muslim, or other hadith collections considered most reliable by Muslims. Ibn Kathir makes no mention of it in his voluminous commentary on the Qur'an. Unfortunately, this tradition appears more often in Islamic apologetics intended for Western consumption than it does in material intended for Muslims themselves. Meanwhile, the devastating effects of verse 4:34 are obvious from the pandemic physical abuse of women in the Islamic world.

But Mr. El-Mallah makes no mention of this, and instead departs from the subject of this Symposium in order to shy bricks at other religious traditions: "Actually, in a fast comparison with the biblical teachings regarding that issue we can see that if a wife entices her husband to worship other than God, then he should stone her to death (Deuteronomy 13:7-12)." So while women are being abused all over the Islamic world, we are being asked not to notice, and instead to tut-tut over a verse of the Bible that no Christian or Jew is putting into practice today. I wish I could say that no Muslim is putting 4:34 into practice today, or that they were all using toothbrushes to beat their wives, but I can't.

El-Mallah then asserts that there is a hadith stating "that women will form the majority of the people of Paradise, see (Sahih Muslim, Kitaab al-Jannah, 4/2179, no. 2834)." The numbering is different in my edition (which was produced by Muslims for Muslims), but I looked up every reference to women in Kitab Al-Jannat of Sahih Muslim. The closest thing I found to El-Mallah's claim was this: "Muhammad reported that some (persons) stated with a sense of pride and some discussed whether there would be more men in Paradise or more women. It was upon this that Abu Huraira reported that Abu'l Qasim (the Holy Prophet) (may peace be upon him) said: The (members) of the first group to get into Paradise would have their faces as bright as full moon during the night, and the next to this group would have their faces as bright as the shining stars in the sky, and every person would have two wives and the marrow of their shanks would glimmer beneath the flesh and there would be none without a wife in Paradise" (no. 6793). This isn't even close to asserting that women will outnumber men in Paradise, unless El-Mallah means that they will because "every person would have two wives." Since these are presented as a reward to the men in Paradise, and since the Qur'an also presents women as a reward for men in Paradise, it hardly counts as

an indication that more women will be blessed than men. It seems much more likely that they are there to be servants.

Mr. El-Mallah then takes me to task for saying, “Imagine if all Muslims were to stone or hang victims of rape or flog women for minor offenses such as exposing a flock of hair.” In fact, it was Ali Sina, not I, who said, that. I will leave the response to Mr. Sina, who is more than capable of defending himself.

In Mr. El-Mallah’s treatment of what I wrote about Pakistani spousal abuse, he says: “Shall we blame Islam for what the Christian men are doing in the US and the Hindu men in India, let alone Philippine, Chili [sic], etc.?” Irrelevant unless Mr. El-Mallah can produce from Christian or Hindu scripture a verse comparable to Qur’an 4:34, along with evidence that Christian and Hindu men are treating their wives in conscious accordance with its dictates. But 4:34 is used by Muslim men to justify the beating of women, which makes Ms. Roach’s statement that “there is nothing anywhere in any of the texts that tells women to take beatings from anyone” simply strange.

As for her assertion that “there is no real Islamic society today on the national level, there is no real and complete implementation of Sharia law, therefore how can anyone criticize Sharia law,” it reminds me of a member of the Revolutionary Communist Party whom I knew in college. She used to dismiss any evidence of the depredations of Communism in the Soviet Union or China with the claim that they weren’t true Communists anyway, so none of what they did counted against Communism! Saudi Arabia and Iran are avowedly Sharia states, and many other Islamic states have adopted various elements of Sharia law, which is public and quite knowable. I suppose we are to believe that the Saudis and Iran, for all their diligence to implement Sharia, all their scholars and all their jurists, missed out on the genuine article? To rule evidence from all these countries out of order because they do not conform to Ms. Roach’s idea of Sharia is simply absurd.

Ms. Roach again indulges in the cheap rhetorical trick of trying to divert attention from Islam, which is the subject of this Symposium, to Christianity, with a number of purported quotations from Church fathers about women. Never mind that no Christian, Catholic, Orthodox, or Protestant, reads such statements as authoritative or normative for their own beliefs or behavior: they have nothing like the authority of Qur’an 4:34 or other foundations of the Islamic oppression of women. We are nevertheless supposed on this basis to subscribe to some dubious moral equivalence. It would be refreshing if Ms. Roach, instead of contenting herself with smearing Christianity, actually confronted the sources of Islamic oppression of women and detailed a way that their devastation could be mitigated.

As for her little lecture on rating hadith, I am well aware of the lineaments of the science of hadith, as well as of the fact that Muslims generally accept Bukhari and Muslim as the most reliable hadith collections. That is why I have quoted them here. If Ms. Roach really thinks

the ones I have quoted are inaccurate or unreliable, let her say so although I am sure she is aware that in doing so, she will be separating herself from the mainstream of Islamic thought past and present. If she does so, I hope she will also explain to us, again, how she proposes to blunt the force of these ahadith among Muslims who, in accord with mainstream Islam, do accept them.

“It might be wise,” asserts Ms. Roach about the “wife-beating verse,” Qur’an 4:34, “for those who criticize the Qur’an to investigate the possibility of mistranslation when reading it.” I wonder why only she seems to know that “daraba” means not “beat” but “light tap, leaving no mark.” This seems to have eluded virtually everyone who has translated the Qur’an into English, Muslim and non-Muslim. Ali, Shakir, Ahamed, Fakhry, Dawood, Arberry and Al-Hilali and Khan have “beat”; Pickthall has “scourge” (no gentle tap, that). Instead of covering up the facts, why not acknowledge them and work for positive change?

Roach: "What can one do against such reckless hate?"-- Tolkien

I want to address only a few things in this response since it seems no matter what is said, one's adversaries (as they have become by their own childish conduct and patronizing language) will reiterate their points without evidence even in the face of evidence that has been supplied against their views. It is clear that those who entered into this symposium did so with their minds already made up, they assume they know everything, they have all the facts. Mr. Sina: just because you have lived in the middle east, does not make you an expert on Islam, just ask Saddam Hussein who believed himself to be a Muslim while he and his sons tortured prisoners, something that is completely forbidden in Islam, (whether you believe it or not) or you might ask some marines that go to Iraq and just from their experiences(which are almost entirely negative because they do not want to be there) form an opinion about all middle easterners (including you) and think they know everything about Islam when what they have seen is a secular country where some people have bent the Islamic rules to suit their own selves(as people do in countries all over the world). And by the way, one thing I love about Islam is that no one but my husband calls me "dear" whether they are trying to patronize me or sexually harass me.

I would like to say that Mr. Sina and Mr. Spencer have only proven my point about the church fathers and those Muslims who are not practicing Islam correctly when they incorporated the examples of two scholars who DO NOT REPRESENT ISLAM, THEY REPRESENT THEIR OWN VIEWS WHICH ARE COMPLETELY DERANGED IN REGARDS TO WOMEN, JUST AS THE CHURCH FATHERS THAT I MENTIONED WERE.

Talk about being outside the mainstream, I have never even heard of these scholars and if I ever encountered anyone using them as a source I would correct their thinking immediately. Who is diverting attention now, to outcast opinions that no one in Islam, at least not true Muslims pay attention to?

You have also proven your own ignorance of true Islam by using the Saudis and their government as an example: no kingship or royal family governances are allowed in Islam, therefore the Saudis, who are supposed to be the caretakers of our holy city Mecca, are laughing in the face of Islam by flaunting their royal family and wealth. We like to call King Fad, King Fraud because he is defrauding the people of his own country, especially the women, who apparently are not allowed to drive, now that is ridiculous, finally a point where Mr. Sina and I agree. It is laughable to me that grown men can pretend not to understand a point of comparison, or say that it lies outside the realm of the topic to depreciate its validity. The rest of my comments I would like to direct toward the readers of this symposium:

Dear interested readers,

No one on this symposium is a scholar of Islam, nor are there scholars of any other kind supplying their opinions here. I implore you as an interested party to research Islam and its criticisms on your own for this is the only way that a person can really make up their own mind about a topic. As a person who used to hate Islam because of the horrible things I HEARD AND PEOPLE TOLD ME I developed a biased opinion based on the conjecture of the media and people's opinions who hated Islam and anything it represented.

I also encourage you to seek out Muslims themselves, get to know your Muslim neighbors or co-workers and you will see that they do no beat their wives, they do not think women are animals, THEIR FAITH DOES NOT ALLOW THEM TO THINK THIS WAY. I am sorry if you have already been "turned" by the lies force fed to you by American media and government, but please do not let that deter you from learning more, even if you disagree with it.

If any Muslim woman feels she is oppressed, it is up to her to ask Allah's help and then with Allah's help free herself by any means necessary, even if it means death. Some people will criticize me saying that a woman shouldn't have to choose to die in order not to be beaten, but I ask you: What do we tell American women who are in domestic violence situations? "Pack your bags, get your kids and go to a shelter" to many women this is the equivalent to death because their husbands seem to find them wherever they go. At least in Islam if this the case, a woman will attain paradise with Allah if she is the innocent victim of a psychopath, instead of just another domestic violence statistic.

Women who know their Islamic rights and study Islam's laws will always find a sheihk or scholar to defend their position because these are men who love Allah and the truth revealed in the Qur’an which protects women. I encourage you to read the Qur’an and consult experts in its meanings so that you might get a better understanding of what it means to be a Muslim. Whatever good has been said here it is from Allah and whatever bad has been said here is from me or the shaitan (satan). Jazakum allahkhair-May Allah reward you all for reading this and listening fairly. Your sister In Islam, Julia Roach.

El-Mallah: Mr. Sina again failed to understand my simple logic when he repeatedly accuses Islam of being the reason behind the mistreatment of women in some so-called Islamic countries. Again this proves nothing when it comes to Islam, since this is the case, as I

stated earlier, in many non-Muslim 3rd world countries, let alone in western countries such as the US.

I would like to point out that my understanding of Quran/Hadith comes from scholars opinions. So what I have mentioned earlier about the equality is not just my opinion, it is the opinion of the scholars to whom I reference. Again, the main problem is that Muslims in the so called Muslim countries are not aware of their religion. One simple proof is the relatively small percentage of them who pray 5 times a day. Where it does not need that much knowledge about Islam to know that prayers are mandatory, and you see many Muslims in Egypt for example who do not pray.

Mr. Sina wants to judge Islam and Quran based on the behavior of the people who do not follow it or understand it comprehensively.

Even that I have to blame these Muslims individually for their ignorance, I have to blame the pro-west governments for not educating people about their religion, which partially is due to the American government influence which preaches secularism.

Of course, not every body will be rewarded equally, the reward depends on the deeds performed by the individual, as well as the bounties that was given to this individual. So what is expected from a king is different that what is expected from a janitor since they were given different bounties. The closest example to illustrate this is the GRE or SAT exams, people get different questions and the questions are weighted differently based on their difficulty level.

Mr. Sina and Mr. Spencer can keep interpreting verses from here and there to try to prove that Islam will give rewards to men in paradise and not to women. They can argue that rewards are not the same. Bottom line this is what Allah said:

"They shall have all that they will desire with their Lord. That is the reward of the good doers." Az-Zumar Ayah 34

So every one will get whatever they want MAN or WOMEN. There is no point to argue about. Whatever the women asks for in paradise she will get. Can anyone think of a better or more fair reward?

Quran is easy to understand and to implement,

"And as for those who believe, they know that it is the Truth from their Lord, but as for those who disbelieve, they say: 'What did Allah intend by this parable?' By it He misleads many, and many He guides thereby. And He misleads thereby only those who are Al-Fasiqun (the rebellious, disobedient to Allah)."

The so called Muslim countries do not implement Islam not because it is difficult to be understood but this is totally a different discussion.

The example that Mr. Sina used (i.e., verse 30:21) only proves without doubt that he is twisting the meaning of the verses to serve his Islam-bashing agenda. This verse talks to both males and females. So God is talking to both, telling them that He has created for them spouses.

Remember the basic rule of Quran interpretation that when masculine words are mentioned, by default, it means both genders, except only in few cases, where the feminine words are mentioned.

But Mr. Sina seems to ignore this rule repeatedly.

So the verse is saying men are created for women and women are created for men. The verse does not talk about enjoyment (that Mr. Sina mentioned) but it mentions tranquility, love and mercy. Even if some Tafsir (e.g. Razi's) said that this verse refers to the fact that Allah (SWT) created Eve from Adam. Does that mean that men are better than women? If this is the logic then dust is better than men, since Adam was created from dust!

About the statements that Mr. Sina quoted from Shirazi, who was a philosopher at the time of the Safavid.

Shirazi is not considered to be a reference to the majority Sunni population, like me. Mr. Sina did not obviously find interpretations of Quran that he can use in his logic except to use the above from Shirazi.

Then he labeled the rest of commentators as apologists, BUT the truth is that old and new KNOWN Sunni commentators NEVER say/said that women are classified in Quran as animals, NEVER.

The statement that was made by my Sister is that there is currently no "real Islamic society on the national level" and "there is no real and complete implementation of Sharia law". WHAT LOGIC led Mr. Sina to say "That is an amazing statement. After 1400 years 1.2 billion Muslims have not managed to implement the Sharia law in any of the 57 Islamic countries. Isn't it reasonable to conclude that such a utopian Islamic paradise exists nowhere except in Ms. Roachs fantasies?"

In English, the words "it does not exist now", does not mean "it never existed for the past 1400 years." It DID exist for centuries, obviously Islamic history and prosperity that led the world in all fronts are easily forgotten.

I do not accept the use of the phrase "apologetic Muslims". We HAVE NOTHING TO APOLOGIZE FOR. We are trying the explain the true religion of Islam away from any wrong practices and misconception because Allah ordered us to do that. We are not doing this in order for you to ACCEPT/LIKE us. We are doing it for the benefit of the readers.

In another proof that Mr. Sina is just copying and pasting recycled misconceptions about Islam, he mentioned the Hadith that says a man’s “prayer would be cut off by (passing of an) ass, woman, and black Dog”.

The above mentioned Hadith is an abrogated one. It was abrogated by the Hadith narrated by Aisha (Al-Bukhari, Volume 1, Book 9, Number 493).

Ibn Hajar in Fath al-Bari mentioned that al-Bukhari adduced this Hadith to show that the fact that a man at prayer faces a woman does not invalidate the prayer. Umm Salamah confirmed Aisha's report that they would be on their menstrual periods and that they would either pass or lay down in front of the Prophet as they prayed, and the Prophet never made mention of any such claimed rule. Ali and Ibn Umar confirmed what Aisha and Umm Salama said, that NONE of the above things invalidated prayers. See (al-Jurjani, al-Kamil fi Duafa, 2:397, 7:104)

Mr. Sina is claiming that since in Islam the husband is the one responsible for the family provisions, then the wife is considered to be the employee, where she has to serve the husband.

I can give Mr. Sina another scenario. How about the poor husband how got to work hard to provide his wife with HER food, HER cloth, HER medicine, HER accommodation, HER transportation, take care of HER children, satisfy HER sexual needs … and the list goes on, while she is setting at HIS home?

In fact, both scenarios do not reflect what Islam teaches. The financial responsibility that the husband needs to fulfill is not less than the home and family responsibility of the wife, and since we are discussing equality between man and woman in Islam, then it is clear indeed that Islam put responsibilities on both parties equally. So unless Sina argues that one party's responsibility is higher/lower than the other, an objective mind should conclude that Islam doesn't discriminate against women.

Mr. Sina is claiming that "A good marriage is one where husband and wife are equal partners in every sense". Well, does that mean that the wife can tell her husband "why is it me how should carry the baby in my tummy?

Why don't you do it?" or "why should I go through the pain of breast feeding, why don't we split this effort between us?"

If this looked absurd then it was meant to be, since the statement of Sina is simply unrealistic. The Islamic approach definitely makes more sense, that is, both husband and wife play an equally important rule although they may have different type of duties.

About women's divorce right, Mr. Sina switched his argument after being faced with the fact that a Muslim women has the right to divorce her husband (which he was denying in his previous response) and instead of admitting this Islamic right of women, which any objective mind would do, he boldly misrepresented the concept of Khole in his comment.

Since the man should give his wife the dowry (marriage gift) to consummate the marriage, then it is fair to say that if the woman does not want to continue such relation, then she

should return that dowry to her husband.

Now what it unfair about this? Mr. Sina's assertions that the wife needs also to forgo her alimony is totally false, even the Hadith he quoted never mention any thing about alimony, nor does any other Hadith related to the issue of Khole.

About the Hadith Abu Dawood 11. 2142: "The Prophet said: A man will not be asked as to why he beat his wife." Mr. Sina just quotes any Hadith that seems to satisfy his lust for bashing Islam without even making sure of its authenticity. The previously mentioned Hadith is an unreliable (weak) one as the Hadith scholars indicated.

About the muwatta30.2.13 story that Mr.Sina's mentioned, we can clearly see that this is not a saying or an order from the prophet. It is rather a ruling made by the judge in case presented to him. In this case that woman lied to her husband about a ruling in the religion; she claimed what God has made lawful to be unlawful because of the jealousy she has towards her maid. Now, what would be the result if everyone lied about a ruling of the law, just to satisfy his personal benefits? The punishment she had was not because her husband wants to sleep with his slave girl, but rather because of lying about the law.

About the story Mr. Sina quoted that Muhammad (PBUH) raised his hand to beat a woman who rejects his advances. Bukhari 7.63.182

Mr. Sina deliberately changed the word mentioned in the Hadith from "to Pat" into "to beat". Is this how scholarly people should behave in such symposium? Here is the entire Hadith so the reader can be aware of how evidence against Islam are fabricated to delude the people.

Narrated Abu Usaid:

We went out with the Prophet to a garden called Ash-Shaut till we reached two walls between which we sat down. The Prophet said, "Sit here," and went in (the garden). The Jauniyya (a lady from Bani Jaun) had been brought and lodged in a house in a date-palm garden in the home of Umaima bint An-Nu'man bin Sharahil, and her wet nurse was with her. When the Prophet entered upon her, he said to her, "Give me yourself (in marriage) as a gift." She said, "Can a princess give herself in marriage to an ordinary man?" The Prophet raised his hand to pat her so that she might become tranquil. She said, "I seek refuge with Allah from you." He said, "You have sought refuge with One Who gives refuge. Then the Prophet came out to us and said, "O Abu Usaid! Give her two white linen dresses to wear and let her go back to her family." Narrated Sahl and Abu Usaid: The Prophet married Umaima bint Sharahil, and when she was brought to him, he stretched his hand towards her. It seemed that she disliked that, whereupon the Prophet ordered Abu Usaid to prepare her and to provide her with two white linen dresses.

I did not say that ALL the chapter names in the Holy Quran necessitates praising the topic mentioned in the Sura (e.g. "The disbelievers" where disbelieving in God is condemned, yet there is another chapter entitled "The believers" where the qualities of the righteous people

are mentioned and praised.) So how do we know if the title is an indication of praise, condemnation, or simply mentioning some facts about it?

It is simply the contents of the Sura that explains that. In the case of chapter 4, Sura Al-Nisaa, God Almighty is explaining some rulings about the believing women and giving them the glad tiding of equality in the reward as stated in verse 4:124. So looking into the content of the Sura, we easily conclude that Islam does not look down to women, which is the topic of this discussion.

About financial security of women and inheritance rules, I already stated that the financial security for a Muslim woman is guaranteed. Her Husband is responsible for that, if she has no husband, then it is her father, brother, or uncle.

If she has no family, then it is the State that should take care of her financially. So under the Islamic law, a woman doesn't need to fend for herself.

If she decided that she needs to work to gain extra money then that does not justify taking extra amount of inheritance or it would be unfair since there is always someone taking care of her financial needs.

So, when a women is divorced she still does not have to support herself . It is the responsibility of her male relatives or the state (if none) to do that. So if she is divorced and she does not have her own money they should support her. Supporting her is not a charity it is an obligation on them.

Mr. Spencer's objection doesn't stand.

About verse 33:50, Mr. Spencer brought a translation that does not contain rape in it. which was exactly what I said. About the consent of the slave girl in sexual relation: Let me correct Mr. Spencer with Verse 24:33. Narrated Jabir ibn Abdullah: "Musaykah, a slave-girl of some Ansari, came and said: My master forces me to commit fornication. Thereupon the following verse was revealed: "But force not your maids to prostitution (when they desire chastity). (24:33)" (Translation of Sunan Abu Dawud, Divorce (Kitab Al-Talaq), Book 12, Number 2304)"

In addition, the Hadith mentioned in AlBukhari when a women said to the prophet peace be upon him after he approached her "She said, "I seek refuge with Allah from you."

He said, "You have sought refuge with One Who gives refuge" and left her. That clearly specify that since that women did not consent, the prophet peace be upon him did not force her to do any thing. See Bukhari 7.63.182

Mr. Spencer, contradicts himself when he accuses the Muslim side of using the "taken out of context" (that ever-ready refuge for dishonest politicians everywhere).

While he uses the “anti-Semitic” (forever-ready sword against anyone how mentions historical issues with the Jews). I’d appreciate it if Mr. Spencer provided proofs that this cross-eyed children story being superstitious instead of his mere claim Mr. Spencer ignored what I have said in my explanation of using Siwak, AGAIN, what the prophet mentioned was “darban ghayr mubarrih” which means light striking, and was interpreted by his companions (like Ibn Abbas) to be as a (symbolic) use of miswak (a small natural toothbrush). For reference, see (Sahih Muslim, Ketab AlHajj, no. 2137, Tafsir Al-Tabari)

Mr. Spencer want to link the women problems in 3rd world countries to Islam, while the reason is the lack of the right understanding of it.

But he does not want to be objective and fair enough to tackle other religions with the same eye, again, refer to Deuteronomy 13:7-12.

You want to tackle the women problems in 3rd world countries, fine, why do not you also tackle the women problems in your own backyard:

Within the US we see the following statistics about how many women are treated in the United States, taken from the 1995 National Crime Victimization Survey of the U.S. Department of Justice and the National Domestic Violence Hotline Fact Sheet and Statistics (You can order this Special Report (NCJ-154348) "Violence Against Women: Estimates from the Redesigned Survey August 1995" by calling the Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse, 800-732-3277and the National Domestic Violence Hotline Fact Sheet and Statistics.)

HOW MANY ABUSED WOMEN ARE THERE IN THE U.S.?

Women age 12 or older annually sustained almost 5 million violent victimizations in 1992 and 1993. Women and girls ages 12 and up annually reported about 500,000 rapes and sexual assaults, almost 500,000 robberies, and about 3.8 million assaults.

WHO ARE THE ABUSERS

In 29% of all violence against women by a lone offender, the perpetrator was an intimate (husband,ex-husband, boyfriend or ex-boyfriend).

Women annually reported about 500,000 rapes and sexual assaults Friends or acquaintances of the victims committed over half of these rapes or sexual assaults. Strangers were responsible for about 1 in 5.

HONOR KILLINGS IN AMERICA?

Of the 5328 women murdered in 1990, FBI data indicate that about half or more of them by a husband or boyfriend.

VIOLENCE AMONG COUPLES

A minimum of 16 % of American couples experienced an assault during the year they were asked about it, and about 40% of these involved severely violent acts, such as kicking, biting, punching, choking, and attacks with weapons.

A 1993 national poll found that 34% of adults in the United States report having witnessed a man beating his wife or girlfriend and that 14% of women report that a husband or boyfriend has been violent with them.

THE PHYSICAL DAMAGE CAUSED TO WOMEN AND CHILDREN BY ABUSE

During the last decade, domestic violence has been identified as one of the major causes of emergency room visits by women.

From 20% to 30% of the women who are seen by emergency room physicians exhibit at least one or more symptoms of physical abuse.

10% of the victims were pregnant at the time of abuse.

10% reported that their children had also been abused by the batterer.

THE ECONOMIC FACTOR IN WOMEN'S ABUSE

*Women aged 19 to 29 and women in families with incomes below $10,000 were more likely than other women to be victims of violence by an intimate.

So the above statistics reflects how women are treated in a so called “Christian Country”. Should we still blame Islam for that?

There are problems behind women being treated like that, Islam is not the cause, the lack of Islam is. Islam provides a solution to these problems.

- **To finish reading this symposium, click here.**